DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 082 HE 012 336

AUTHOR Watters, Eric D.: Lunney, Gerald H.
TITLE The Independent Sector and Statewide Planning for Higher Education: The Data Initiative.
INSTITUTION Kentucky Council of Independent Colleges and Universities, Danville.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 59p.; For related documents, see HE 012 335-337
AVAILABLE FROM Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities, Danville, KY 40422

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy; Data Analysis; *Data Bases; Data Collection; Government School Relationship; *Higher Education; *Management Information Systems; Policy Formation; *Private Colleges; *Professional Associations; Program Descriptions; State Government; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky; National Center for Higher Education Management; *State Level Information Base

ABSTRACT

A description is presented of the first two years of a review that assessed the State Level Information Base (SLIB) project of the National Center for Higher Education Management. The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities undertook this investigation to determine the relevance of an externally developed data system for independent colleges and also to develop procedures for including the independent sector in any planning activities that would take place in the states as they implemented SLIB. Policy recommendations made by the Council are summarized. Appendices provide a list of concerns to be covered in a policy statement regarding data requests, the proposed data brokerage function for the state association, a description of the research committee that was established within the Council to direct the data brokerage function for the association, a detailed discussion of the potential that exists for research based on government surveys, a list of the planning concerns suggested by SLIB, and the responses that the task force made to the data collection tables listed in the field review edition of the SLIB Manual. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183082

Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities

Danville, Kentucky 40422

Telephone 606/236-3533

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Council of Independent Ky Colleges & Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 012 336

THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR AND STATEWIDE PLANNING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION: THE DATA INITIATIVE

by

Eric D. Watters

and

Gerald H. Lunney

Copyright © 1980 by
Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities

MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL OF INDEPENDENT KENTUCKY COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Jerry C. Davis, President, Alice Lloyd College, Pippa Passes, Kentucky 41844
Dr. Dennis F. Kinlaw, President, Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky 40390
Dr. Eugene V. Petrik, President, Bellarmine College, Louisville, Kentucky 40205
Dr. Willis D. Weatherford, President, Berea College, Berea, Kentucky 40404
Sister George Ann Cecil, President, Brescia College, Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
Dr. W. R. Davenport, President, Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Kentucky 42718
Dr. Thomas A. Spragens, President, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky 40422
Dr. James M. Boswell, President, Cumberland College, Williamsburg, Kentucky 40769
Dr. Ben M. Elrod, President, Georgetown College, Georgetown, Kentucky 40324
Dr. Luther W. White, III, President, Kentucky Wesleyan College Owensboro, Kentucky 42301
Dr. Troy R. Eslinger, President, Lees Junior College, Jackson, Kentucky 41339
Dr. John B. Begley, President, Lindsey Wilson College, Columbia, Kentucky 42728
Dr. Nelson M. Hoffman, Jr., President, Midway College, Midway, Kentucky 40347
Dr. Jackson O. Hall, President, Pikeville College, Pikeville, Kentucky 41501
Sister Catherine Mahady, President, St. Catharine College, St. Catharine, Kentucky 40061
Sister Eileen M. Egan, President, Spalding College, Louisville, Kentucky 40203
Dr. Earl F. Hays, President, Sue Bennett College, London, Kentucky 40741
Dr. Robert J. Giroux, President, Thomas More College, Ft. Mitchell, Kentucky 41017
Dr. William W. Kelly, President, Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky 40508
Dr. Mahlon A. Miller, President, Union College, Barbourville, Kentucky 40906

KENTUCKY FORD FOUNDATION PROJECT
December, 1977 -- December, 1979

NATIONAL PANEL

Robert C. Bowie, Vice President for Finance and Management Systems, Johns Hopkins University
Virginia Fadil, Director of Research, National Institute for Independent Colleges and Universities
Hans Jenny, Vice President for Finance, Business and Budgeting, College of Wooster
Larry Litten, Director of Research, Consortium on Financing Higher Education
James Olliver, Director of Research, North Carolina Association of Independent Colleges and Universities

STATE TASK FORCE

Willis Weatherford, President, Berea College, Chairman
Ruth Blackburn, Registrar, Transylvania University
Jonnie Blair, Director of Institutional Planning, Lees Junior College (1978-79)
Barry Dixon, Director of Personnel Services, Centre College
Robert Epley, Assistant to the President, Union College (1977-78)
William Hovenden, Dean, Alice Lloyd College (1977-78)
John O. Kampschaefer, Vice President for Financial Affairs, Bellarmine College
Roger Kusche, Dean, Asbury College (1978-79)
Elinor Starr, Director of Student Financial Aid, Spalding College

PROJECT STAFF

John W. Frazer, Executive Director, CIKCU
Gerald H. Lunney, Director of Research, CIKCU, Project Director
Eric D. Watters, Research Associate

Acknowledgements

The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities is deeply grateful to the Ford Foundation and to Dr. Fred Crossland, not only for providing the financial capability to attempt this project, but for the foresight and concern they have displayed in regard to the independent sector of higher education.

The project also owes much to the members of the National Panel for the challenges they put forth and the guidance and support they offered in our quest to address those challenges.

Also to be commended are the efforts of the State Task Force. These individuals contributed insight and expertise, in addition to hard work, that propelled the undertaking and gave it substance.

Our appreciation is extended, in addition, to Mr. John Frazer whose keen understanding of higher education and steady hand in appraising and confronting its matters, served both to encourage and direct the work of the project.

Finally, our thanks go to Audrey Davenport whose tireless typing and patient "proofing" were of invaluable service to the endeavor.

Eric D. Watters
Gerald H. Lunney
January, 1980

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Conclusion and Recommendations	3
Phase I, Kentucky Ford Project: The First Year	9
Phase II, Kentucky Ford Project: The Second Year	15
Phase III, Data Collection Activity	23

Appendices

A. Concerns to be covered in a Policy Statement Regarding Data Requests	27
B. The Data Brokerage Function for the State Association	29
C. The Structure and Responsibilities of the CIKCU Research Committee	33
D. About That Data Base That is Hiding in the Closet	37
E. Summary of the Final SLIB Structure	49
F. Kentucky Ford Project Reactions to the Preliminary SLIB Data Tables	51

Introduction

Whenever an external agency develops a data set which has the potential for becoming the basic reporting system for a college or set of colleges, there is a strong likelihood of a negative response. When the set of colleges consists of independent institutions and the proposed data set possesses the potential of being a reporting system adopted by a state higher education coordinating agency, there is a great concern about the potential impact of the data set on the independence of, perhaps even the viability of, the private institutions.

Such an externally developed data set was the field review edition of the State Level Information Base, a document put together through a project undertaken by the National Center for Education Management Systems. The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities, through a grant from the Ford Foundation, developed a response to the State Level Information Base (SLIB) from the perspective of potential concerns for private colleges and universities. This response was not based on any actual or perceived animosity between Kentucky's independent institutions and the Kentucky Council on Higher Education, the state's coordination agency. It was, rather, a response designed to highlight the relationship between private institutions and a public agency. Its purpose was to point out the potential of misuse of data should the relationship deteriorate and to stress the unnecessary paperwork burden which could be imposed by a state agency's expectation that private institutions should provide the same data as public institutions, even though some of the data, those required for that agency's statutory responsibilities, go far beyond its relationship with the private institutions.

The response could only be based on the Kentucky experience, the relationships that exist and the programs that are in place. It was not likely, therefore, that each specific recommendation would be applicable to every state. But it was hoped, however, that the approach adopted in reviewing this data system would be relevant to other states' situations and needs. The response recommended, in general, that state agencies, in requesting planning data from independent colleges and universities, be sensitive to the nature of these institutions, its relationship to the institutions and the burden which its data requests will place on the institutions.

Furthermore, the response stressed the fact that a significant amount of information exists in a variety of state agencies which could be used by individual colleges and universities for institutional planning. Examples of this information include demographic analyses and projections by county, participation rates by age/sex/race, economic analyses and migration patterns. It was felt that the SLIB contained a framework for the collection and display of these data and that the state coordinating

agency should accept the responsibility of collecting and maintaining these data and providing them to individual colleges and universities, both public and private, for use at the institutional level.

Since the time of the Task Force's response, the final edition of SLIB has been published. And, while the suggested data element tables must still be a matter of concern for the independent sector, the framework in which SLIB recommends these tables is markedly different in the final version. Indeed, the SLIB as it now stands, stresses the desirability of individual states determining their own data needs and, in addition, urges the states to recognize the various needs and capabilities of the public and independent sectors within each state. In this spirit the pro-active stance that the CIKCU Task Force has adopted in the second year of the project can be viewed more readily as a part of the SLIB framework, rather than apart from it. Furthermore, the Kentucky Project becomes an invaluable initiative in generating planning data, an initiative that offers guidance and suggestions for independent institutions and state planning agencies in other states.

This report will trace the CIKCU Ford Project from its inception, restating the initial concerns which spawned the project, delineating the Task Force's reactions to the field review edition of SLIB, enumerating the changes in the final SLIB document and discussing the actions taken by the Task Force during the second year of the project in compliance with the National Panel's directive that they develop a data brokerage model for CIKCU.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities undertook the project described in this report because of a strong conviction that independent colleges and universities must be involved with statewide planning for higher education. If anything, that conviction has been further strengthened during the life of the project. This has come not only from the thoughts of the National Panel, the work of the State Task Force or the efforts of the staff, but from external forces as well.

Recent economic trends and the realities of demography over the next several years are two of these forces. The pressures on higher education in general and on the state higher education agencies (Coordinating Boards, Planning Councils, etc.) in particular will be enormous. In most states, the public sector is by far the greater part of higher education. For this reason, as well as the concerns related to the expenditure of public monies, most of these agencies' time and energy will be spent on planning for the state-supported institutions. Relations between state agencies and independent institutions range from active cooperation through benign neglect to open hostility. Even in the most positive situations, however, the pressures will militate against much planning involving independent colleges and universities.

These realities lead to the basic conclusion reached by the parties who worked on this project:

> Independent colleges and universities, through their state associations, must develop data analysis and planning capacity which is free standing from governmental agencies.

With this capacity the independent sector will, at the very least, have a constant reminder for the state agency of its responsibility to include all institutions in its planning activity. In states where cooperation has taken place, the state agency may simply include the results of the state association's efforts in regularly published planning reports. In those states where the state agency disregards the independent sector in its efforts, adequate data analysis and planning by the sector will provide vital information to those other audiences who have a stake in the directions in which higher education will move over the next several years.

This conclusion is so important that the development of the data analysis and planning capacity must be rapid, efficient and effective. The following five recommendations are made to foster this development.

Data Coordination: The involvement of the independent sector in statewide planning must itself be planned. The process, degree and nature of involvement must be spelled out. Most of the involvement will entail the provision of data and information. Appendix A lists some concerns which should be considered in determining this involvement. Of special note is the fact that governmental agencies gather and compile data which could be useful to institutions. Examples of such data are economic, employment and census statistics. The state agency could serve a valuable function as a conduit of governmental data to both public and independent institutions. In addition to being well planned, the involvement of the independent sector must be stated as policy. Working relationships between agency and association staffs and the institutions are vital for effective planning, but written policy is needed to insulate the relationship from changes in personnel. What seems most feasible is a

statement with which all parties can agree.

> Recommendation #1. A policy document describing the relationship between independent higher education and the state higher education planning agency should be developed and approved by the policy boards of both the state agency and the state association of independent colleges and universities.

Data Criteria: The proliferation of data requests from a myriad of sources, and the institution's recurring dilemma of wanting and needing to participate in a wide range of studies but having to recognize the realities of such participation (high cost, limited personnel, etc.), prompt the need for assurance that meaningful information can be provided without too great an expense or burden to the independent institution.

> Recommendation #2. In determining what information and data elements concerning independent colleges and universities should be provided to state agencies, and to assure that the benefits to the institutions will be commensurate with the cost of their provision, the state agency should frame its requests and the independent institutions weigh such requests according to the following criteria:
>
> a) The only data that should be provided are data for planning.
> b) Data definitions should be in terms of institutionally useful data.
> c) Only data for which there is a currently demonstrated need should be provided.

The Brokerage Function: A key element to the successful involvement of independent institutions in statewide planning is a point of focus within the independent sector which can facilitate the gathering of data from the schools while insulating them from unreasonable data demands and which can, because of that focus, be aware of the policy implications of data requests while being sensitive to the overall planning process. This data brokerage function, described in detail

in Appendix B is a natural extension of the current role of the state association of independent colleges and universities. In fact, this recommendation is the primary recommendation in this report and flows directly from the conclusion which was reached in this project.

> Recommendation #3. The state association should serve as a broker for data concerning independent higher education. The brokerage responsibility would function, not only as a means of implementing and affirming the independent institutions' relationship with the state agency and other external agencies, but would also facilitate self-initiated planning activities among the independent institutions.

Data Management: In order to adequately implement Recommendation #3, a mechanism must be established to provide the state association with the technical expertise and experience to perform the data brokerage role for the institutions. This is especially true when the association has only one professional on staff or staff lacks expertise in research design and computer applications. Even with these staff capabilities, however, the association needs to be sensitive to the data demands and data needs at the individual institutions. Appendix C describes the Research Committee which was established within the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities because of this project. This committee is the mechanism, the structure within Kentucky which will direct the data brokerage function for the association. Depending on the particular state association, this structure would need to be altered to accommodate the association capabilities.

Capability in research methodology and computer applications would seem vital to the mechanism however it was implemented. An extremely sensitive area which would need to be addressed concerns the collection

and storage of the data which the association would gather. There would need to be a certain amount of mutual trust if one institution were to provide the computer capacity for the association. An alternative possibility, probably expensive, would be the use of an independent computer service bureau. The main point is that this question would need to be faced early in the process of developing the state association's research committee.

> Recommendation #4. In order to meet its data brokerage responsibility the state association must establish a mechanism to utilize the expertise and experience of the institutions to guide and direct the association's data analysis and planning activities.

Data Utilization: Institutions currently complete numerous surveys for the state and federal government. If properly analyzed, these surveys can yield important planning information. In addition, significant savings could be realized if studies are made from regularly completed surveys. For a more detailed discussion of the potential which exists for research based on government surveys, see Appendix D.

If the independent sector's planning activities extend beyond these government surveys, one possible source of a structure for planning and for survey instruments is the final report of the State Level Information Base Project of NCHEMS. A list of the planning concerns suggested by SLIB is presented in Appendix E.

> Recommendation #5. The projects undertaken in fulfillment of the brokerage function, by whatever mechanism is established to implement that function, should be based on currently gathered data, if possible. Only when an area of concern falls outside of any current survey's information potential should a different form be selected or developed.

Phase I
Kentucky Ford Project:
The First Year

This project was conceived at the time that the field review edition of the State Level Information Base (SLIB) manual was released by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). In many respects it was developed because of concern that the SLIB was not adequately sensitive to the data needs and capabilities of independent, non-profit institutions.

Through the project a rationale for the involvement of independent colleges and universities in the state planning/data generation process has been developed. This rationale has been used as the basis for evaluating the data tables in the SLIB project. The rationale includes the following arguments:

Independent Colleges and Universities must be included in the statewide planning for higher education. In fact, all institutions which are providing postsecondary services, whatever their structure or control, should be involved in postsecondary planning. Institutions which are not involved in the planning process run the risk of "not existing" for planning purposes. The minimum involvement in planning is the provision of data which describe an institution and its programs so that its services are not made redundant.

Secondly, coordination and governance are not differences in degree but are two separate dimensions of the relationship between state agencies and educational institutions. A high degree of coordination can exist

within a voluntary consortium of institutions. At the same time, there might be little or no coordination of activities between the branches of a state system of higher education. Each state's higher education agency serves in both a coordination and governance role. Independent colleges and universities can participate in the planning and coordination activities without being involved with the governance activities.

Finally, because of their differences in control, state-supported and independent colleges and universities have different levels of responsibility for accountability to the general public. Both types of institutions have governing boards to whom its institutions are immediately accountable. Because state-supported institutions are creatures of government, their governing boards are actually surrogates for the general public. The public, then has the right to know a much greater amount of information about state-supported institutions (quasi-governmental agencies) than it needs from independent institutions, even though both kinds of institutions are operating for the public good. Therefore, those data the public can require of independent institutions ought to be limited to those elements concerning operation for the public good.

Three tests should be used to determine which data elements concerning independent colleges and universities should be provided to state agencies. These tests are:

1. The only data that should be provided are data needed for planning.

2. Data definitions should be in terms of <u>institutionally</u> useful data.

3. Only data for which there is a currently demonstrated need should be provided.

Using these tests institutions can provide meaningful data without too great an expense or burden. This rationale guided the initial review of each table in the field edition of the SLIB manual. Moreover, the Task Force recommends that such a rationale be adopted wherever independent institutions are asked to supply data to external agencies.

The responses which the Task Force made to the data collection tables listed in the Field Review edition of the SLIB Manual are listed in Appendix F. Their inclusion is meant for guidance and instruction since the final SLIB product has changed significantly. It can be expected, however, that many of the data collection forms will be proposed by state agencies when they develop their state planning data systems. It is to be hoped that the responses and rationale developed in this project will assist independent institutions as they work with their state agencies to define the data set needed from independent higher education for state planning.

The State Level Information Base project conducted by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, after receiving input and reactions from a broad range of sources, including the CIKCU-Ford Task Force, has published five documents under the general title of Postsecondary-Education Information Planning at the State Level. The five documents include the following: Overview, Planning Guide, Selection of Data to Address Planning Issues, Pilot-Test State Case Studies, and Systems-Related Experiences in Eight Pilot-Test States. While the CIKCU-Ford Task Force has not had the opportunity to fully examine these documents, the publications themselves identify major

shifts in emphases in the project which signal a greater awareness and understanding of the broad spectrum of higher education institutions, their distinctions and unique qualities, which statewide planning systems must serve. Of particular importance are the changes in Selection of Data to Address Planning Issues, the document that serves as the revised edition of the original SLIB manual. Shifts in focus include the following:

1. From the development of a standardized information base and supporting software, to the development of an adaptable and flexible data-assessment framework with individual states making their own software choices based, in part, upon experiences of pilot-tested states.

2. From the definition of an all-encompassing data universe to support state-level planning, to the definition and analysis of decision making requirements associated with common postsecondary education issues as the basis for data determination and selection.

3. From states having direct computer access to the information systems in other states, to the promotion of the exchange of profile information among interested states after specific issues have been identified and specialized definitions and procedures have been developed.

4. From a concentration on state-level planning decisions only, to a consideration of federal planning issues, to coordination of definitions and data descriptions between the state and federal data-reference documents, and to an increased emphasis on the need for institutional involvement and an awareness of institutional capabilities. (p 1.1, 1.2)

The document, in turn, emphasizes the following approaches:

1. The understanding of common planning issues first and then identifying data related to those issues.

2. The selection, modification and adaptation of data included in the document.

3. The use of the document in a reference capacity to review the issues and data framework in order that a state can determine its own decision requirements and associated data needs. (p 1.2-1.3)

Regarding the state-institutional interface in the collection of data, the Overview makes these points:

1. It is important that a state agency be selective in the process of identifying data items, avoiding a collect-everything approach in the development of an information system.

2. A state agency should be willing to cite the specific uses for the data collected.

3. A state agency must consider institutional resource capabilities, both short-term and long-term, for providing data. (p 14-16)

Then, with specific reference to the independent sector of higher education and as a direct reflection of CIKCU-Ford Task Force input, the Overview states:

> The relationship between independent institutions and state-level information-system planning was not extensively explored during the project, and issues related to the independent sector's involvement seem best resolved within the conventions and structures of each state. The considerable variability in control and funding base that characterizes independent institutions, as well as the potential data burden, suggests that information-system planners in each state need to consult fully with the range of institutions in their independent sector if the latter are to be included in such an effort.
>
> Three issues emerged as individuals in independent institutions and their state associations considered state-level data collection and use: (1) the need to preserve and enhance the hallmark of the independent sector--its independence, (2) the need to provide the independent sector with information suitable to the planning of its institutions, and (3) the need to provide information to the state so that state planning can be cognizant of the mission, capacity, and condition of the independent institutions. Data that appear to serve one function can easily compromise another. These problems should be further explored as the nature and

> functions of state-level information are worked out in each state and as the effects of various required and voluntary levels of independent-sector data provision are determined. (p 16)[1]

These shifts in focus, amendments and additions to the original SLIB manual alleviate some of the concerns of the independent sector, and they point the way to a more constructive, cooperative planning enterprise.

[1]The basic language was prepared by Larry Litten, a member of the SLIB Advisory Committee and the Kentucky Project National Panel, as a result of this project's deliberations.

Phase II
Kentucky Ford Project:
The Second Year

The joint meeting of the Kentucky Ford Project's National Panel and State Task Force in October, 1978 brought about a significant shift in the emphasis of the project. As originally conceived the project was designed to react to an externally developed statewide planning and data system in terms of its relevance for independent colleges as they became involved with the public sector and state agencies in statewide planning for higher education. The specific external planning system which was reviewed was the State Level Information Base developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. The reaction to this system included statements of concern about the danger and difficulty involved for independent institutions in an uncritical acceptance of an externally developed data system. The remainder of the project was envisioned to be an effort to refine the set of data which the Panel, Task Force and staff agreed should be provided to the state agency and then gather the data which had been identified in order to determine the value of the data as well as the cost and problems involved in the collection process.

The consensus of the meeting was that the reaction to SLIB was a significant undertaking. The group felt, however, that more significant activity could be undertaken as Phase II of the project. Each institution has planning needs and has developed its planning activities

more or less to the level it feels necessary. Although these planning needs may not be identical, they should be similar and, moreover, they should be related to state planning needs. The data implications are apparent.

The CIKCU-Ford Task Force suggested, therefore, that Phase II of Kentucky's Ford Project be the establishment of a model for developing information about the independent institutions which would be available to state planners and other interested parties, and which would be based on data which the institutions, singly and collectively, would be able to use for planning.

From time to time various planning problems would be identified. Some of these would be generated internally, while others might be stimulated by external sources. If a particular planning problem were deemed important enough to be investigated, a study group would be established. The group would consist primarily of persons with responsibility in the particular area under investigation, but other persons would be involved to stimulate a broad view of the problem. This group would identify the relevant data elements and would develop a procedure for gathering the needed data. Those institutions who were sufficiently concerned about the problem would participate in the investigation. A report which included a summary of findings and the conclusions would then be prepared and could be made available to interested parties at the discretion of those institutions which had participated.

There are three key elements to this model. First, each problem must be of common enough concern to the institutions for it to be investigated. Within Kentucky, the Research Committee of the Council

of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities might serve as the group which would make this decision. Second, participation in any particular investigation would be voluntary. If a given institution did not feel a particular investigation was worth the commitment of time and resources, that institution could elect not to participate. At the same time, the coordinated investigation of mutual problems would provide participating institutions with comparable data from sister institutions as each determined its own policy concerning the problem. The third element is the fact that information, not necessarily data, would be made available to external agencies. This would answer the major concern of the loss of control over data requested by an external agency and the accompanying potential for misinterpretation of those data.

In this way the state association, CIKCU, could serve as a broker for data concerning the independent institutions. It could be a focal point for requests concerning the colleges. It would act, through its Research Committee, as a guide to the institutions concerning the action which should be taken with regard to data requests. The association could provide its institutions with comparative planning data through its coordinated research projects. Finally, it could provide external agencies with aggregated information which would represent the independent sector without stressing specific institutions.

Four general areas of concern were identified by the persons at the joint meeting. These are: student market and enrollment information, institutional management, student aid, and academic programs. Examples of specific areas which might be investigated include: the identification

and monitoring of sources of new students, transfer studies, retention studies, institutional finances, insurance programs, facilities utilization, participation in governmental, private and institutional aid programs, listing and description of academic majors, and outcomes studies. The important point in the model is that the identification and prioritization of investigations would be based on data which the institutions determine and which they can use.

It must be noted that the institutions currently gather and share much data, both among themselves and with external agencies, which can be useful in this model. Furthermore, the group felt it would be wise to review current activities to see if they might be improved or if better use can be made of the information they provide. At the same time, the fact needs to be emphasized that governmental agencies and other groups external to the institutions gather information which each institution and the institutions working together would find useful. The need exists for an efficient use of this information; the institutions should not expend energy or resources to gather information which exists at some other source.

The CIKCU-Ford Task Force emphasized that the purpose of this process is not to withdraw from larger planning activities or to act in isolation, but to let institutions become involved in these planning activities in the most effective and efficient way possible.

Recommendations from the CIKCU-Ford Task Force

As the first step in the implementation of this model, the CIKCU-Ford Task Force recommended the following:

> That member institutions continue to provide enrollment data to the Kentucky Council on

> Higher Education and the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) through KCHE to the Federal Government. At the same time the institutions, working through CIKCU and with KCHE, the National Center for Education Statistics, and other interested organizations and individuals, attempt to develop a reporting system to provide data which has meaning at the institutional, sector, state and national levels, which recognizes the institution's ability to provide data and the institutions' specific planning concerns.
>
> and
>
> That the member institutions, working through CIKCU, develop a planning data system based upon institutional planning needs. Initially, four areas of concern would be pursued: finances, student need/demand, financial aid, and programs. Committees of institutional representatives would be appointed in each area to work with the CIKCU staff to identify specific planning questions and the data needed to provide answers to those questions. While the majority of persons on each committee would have professional responsibility in the area of concern, each group would be supplemented by other administrative (and faculty) personnel who could provide breadth of perception to the committee.

The State Task Force, charged with carrying out these recommendations, then approved the following actions and projects. First, the State Task Force recommended to the Council that it establish the CIKCU Research Committee along the lines proposed. The Research Committee is designed to serve the ongoing function of determining research priorities for the planning needs of the independent institutions in Kentucky. The committee would define various planning problems and, if they were deemed important enough to be investigated, the Research Committee would establish a study group.

The Research Committee would also serve in the capacity of reviewing all data requests made of Kentucky's independent institutions. This process could reduce the burden placed on the colleges, would alleviate the duplication of data supply efforts and, most critically, would insure that the benefits to the sector and the institution would relate favorably to the cost of providing the data. This would lead, eventually, to the development of a data bank at CIKCU which could then be used to transmit analyses and planning information to the requesting agent without imposing on the institution(s).

Specifically, the Research Committee adopted the following guidelines for handling data requests:

1. That the CIKCU staff, with guidance from the CIKCU Research Committee, establish a procedure for policy review of data requests.

2. That all data requests from state governmental agencies be coordinated by the CIKCU staff through the Kentucky Council on Higher Education.

3. That the CIKCU staff work with KCHE to reduce, as much as possible, the burden on institutional time and resources entailed in meeting governmental data requests.

4. That the member institutions provide enrollment and HEGIS data on a continuing basis to the KCHE for its internal use and/or transmittal and that CIKCU staff be instructed to continue conversations with, and through, the KCHE staff concerning the modification or elimination of such sections of these continuing reports that do not contribute to a system of planning data based on institutional data needs.

5. That the CIKCU staff be instructed to monitor these, and subsequently approved, continuing data requests and work to obtain copies of the reports from the appropriate agency for inclusion in the CIKCU planning data bank.

6. That the member institutions endorse the principle that responses to other data requests which the membership has collectively agreed to fulfill should be collected through the CIKCU Research Office and that the responses, once generated, should become part of the CIKCU data bank.

7. That the membership, working through CIKCU, develop a planning data system based upon institutional and independent sector planning needs.

The Research Committee recognizes, of course, that institutional participation in such an endeavor would be voluntary and that some institutions may choose to abstain from such a process.

The Research Committee is to be composed of seven (7) institutional representatives who will serve three year terms on the Committee. Members will be chosen in such a way as to reflect diversity both in terms of institutions and positions held. The Committee will seek to represent the following administrative offices: President, Academic Dean, Chief Business Officer, Financial Aid Officer, Registrar, Institutional Research Officer, etc. Moreover, the Committee will attempt to achieve geographical balance and a proportional balance of two and four year institutions. Initially, the terms of the Committee's membership will be staggered so that continuity can be maintained.

At its next regularly scheduled meeting, the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities adopted the Task Force's recommendation concerning creation of a research committee. The operating guidelines for this committee are presented in Appendix C. The Council further acted to change the Task Force to the CIKCU Research Committee. The Committee has been operating under these guidelines since that time while continuing its efforts as the Ford Project Task Force.

The Research Committee is also studying the potential of garnering information needed for planning from data already in existence. The HEGIS reports are the most obvious sources of such data. The HEGIS data are

particularly appropriate because the instruments employed are both standardized and consistent. Granted, the HEGIS is not a complete data system, but an institution, simply by reviewing its reports over the past few years, can conduct uncomplicated longitudinal studies and thereby pinpoint certain trends. The data can also be used comparatively, a process which, in turn, could foster cooperation and communication between/among institutions. Possible studies include enrollment patterns, attrition-retention and changes in degrees conferred by discipline. The Research Committee will pursue this analysis of existing sources of data and suggest approaches that the institutions, either singly or collectively, may wish to adopt. (For a further examination of this subject, see Appendix D "About That Data Base That is Hiding in the Closet...", a paper by Gerald H. Lunney.)

To make feasible the studies mentioned above, and those that will be developed in the future, and to make possible the establishment of a central data bank for the CIKCU institutions, the Research Committee authorized the acquisition of an in-house computer system. This system, made possible by the Ford Foundation, can not only be used to ease the burden of data demands on the independent institutions, but will enable the CIKCU staff to conduct ad hoc studies that will further assist these institutions in their ongoing operations.

Phase III

Data Collection Activities

With the development of the Council's computer capacity, programs have been written and data have been stored which will provide interested parties with valuable information. Among the information in place is the capacity to generate five-year enrollment summaries by institution, by two-year and four-year totals and aggregated totals. The view of enrollment trends thus produced is extemely instructive. Similarly, four year trends of financial ratios are available. These ratios include income ratios, expenditure ratios and fund balance ratios. Each institution can compare itself with the other CIKCU members on each ratio for each year. By viewing the trends across years an institution can see the impact of past policy decisions and can develop realistic planning strategies. Information concerning graduates, by level and major field of instruction is also available.

The Research Committee has stressed the need for a survey of Financial Aid. Because federal and state student-centered funding to higher education has become crucial to most colleges and universities in recent years, and seems destined to grow in importance as it affects the continuation of high quality education, the Research Committee determined that Student Financial Aid should be the focus of early data generating activities.

The Student Financial Aid study seeks to identify data that are necessary to operate a financial aid office, to provide a college the means of comparing its operation with that of another college, and to

facilitate planning and administering financial aid programs. The study will also answer questions regarding the percentage of tuition that is realized as net revenue, the percentage of the student population receiving unfunded aid, the relationships among the types of student aid and the sources of aid and how these patterns of support might be used in recruiting students, the effectiveness of the programs in meeting student needs and the per-student cost of running the financial aid office. The data generated to provide answers to these questions could also be used to address other planning issues, such as retention rates and effect on future alumni giving to the college.

The Council office, at the request of the member presidents, is also preparing two salary studies; one of full-time faculty and one of administrators. These studies will come from HEGIS and CUPA surveys respectively. The thrust of the studies is that the normal publication of the information contained in these studies comes too late to use the current year's information for the next year's planning. The studies will provide comparative data by the next January first so that the institutions will have the most up-to-date information available for the next budget cycle.

APPENDICES

Concerns to be Covered in a Policy Statement Regarding Data Requests

1) The role of independent colleges and universities in statewide planning.

2) The place of the state association in the planning process.

3) The provisions for policy review of data requests.

4) The coordination of governmental data requests through the state agency.

5) The procedure by which the state agency can provide the independent sector with data and information which resides in governmental agencies.

6) The determination of ways to minimize the burden on institutional time and resources entailed in meeting governmental data requests.

7) The specification of the list and form of the data elements which the state agency will need so that the independent sector can be included in statewide planning.

The Data Brokerage Function for the State Association

The importance of the data brokerage role for the state association rests in the power of joint, cooperative action. In most states, each independent college is small. Considered together, however, the independent institutions represent a large entity within a state's higher education community; larger than many of the state institutions. Singly, an institution would be reluctant to disregard a data request from a governmental agency. Singly, an institution would have difficulty shaping the nature and form of that request. Singly, an institution might not have the resources to conduct comprehensive institutional research; even if it did it would not have a context for judging its data. Singly, institutions spend too much time responding to data requests. Together, the institutions can develop a group response to a data request. Together, they can work to shape the nature and form of the request. Together, by pooling resources, they can conduct institutional research and obtain data from sister institutions which provide a context for self-evaluation. Together the institutions could form a data base which could serve as a source of information for the multitude of persons who request data from them. A logical place for the management of this cooperative action is the state association of independent colleges and universities. The data brokerage function is a translation into the area of data analysis and planning of the rationale which led originally to the formation of the state associations.

The number of survey forms which reach the various offices of a college campus is monumental. Institutional time and resources must be used to complete the forms, scarce resources that the institution needs for other purposes. The good will and accuracy with which the forms are completed varies from person to person and time to time depending on a variety of circumstances. In addition, the information gathered in a survey might be damaging to an institution if it is misused or put in an improper context. One part of the data brokerage function is to develop an awareness on the part of the association staff of the various surveys and questionnaires which go to colleges. By knowing the nature of these data requests, advice can be given to the individual institutions concerning the policy implications, importance and duplication of various surveys and questionnaires. The advisory nature of the data brokerage activity must be emphasized. The establishment of the state association as a data broker should not reduce the institution's freedom or responsibility in the area of data analysis and planning. The purpose of the brokerage function is to provide services to the institutions which they could not obtain individually. The use of the services is always at the discretion of the institutions.

Once the awareness of the nature of data requests is developed, the association, as data broker, can begin to negotiate the form and content of the requests so that duplication is eliminated and the questionnaires are as easy as possible for the institutions to complete. The association could also begin to review new requests, testing them in the area of policy implications, importance and duplication.

The most important element of the data brokerage function is the facilitation of cooperatively initiated surveys and research projects. These projects will provide the colleges with institutional and comparative planning data. Cooperative efforts could be more cost effective than individual efforts. As the information from these surveys and projects is gathered, the state association will develop a data base concerning the institutions. In time, this data base could serve as the principal source of information for many people who currently inundate individual institutions with data requests. Of great importance is the fact that the self-initiated studies might eliminate or affect the character of external surveys and questionnaires. If the institutions have collectively studied an area of general concern, they will be in a position of being able to provide information about that area in a form of their own choosing rather than having to fill out another questionnaire.

A last, and significant, point is that the institutions, through the state association, will be able to provide information and not merely data to interested external parties. A major concern in providing data to various requesters is the potential for misinterpretation and misuse. By providing some analysis, sensitive data can be presented in aggregated form without drawing unwarranted attention to any one institution. The financial "softness" of the sector can be demonstrated without listing the condition at any given school.

Individual associations, just as individual institutions, will respond to the role of data broker in different ways. This is part of the genius of the independent sector of higher education. Whatever the response, it seems time to consider the role of data broker as the next step in the development of the state association of independent colleges and universities.

The Structure and Responsibilities of the CIKCU Research Committee

PURPOSE: The CIKCU Research Committee will serve three functions for the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities. 1) To make policy recommendations to the member institutions concerning specific responses to external data requests, especially requests from government agencies; 2) To identify and define the direction of the research efforts internal to CIKCU; and, 3) To oversee and advise the CIKCU research office of its ongoing activities.

STRUCTURE: The CIKCU Research Committee will be appointed by the Council, upon the recommendation of the Executive Director. The committee will be generally representative of the member institutions and the major areas of data concern. Persons appointed to the Research Committee will not serve more than three years consecutively.

New members will be appointed at the Fall meeting of the Council and will assume their responsibilities on the following January 1. Ideally, the number of new appointments would be less than half of the committee membership.

While serving as the Ford Project State Task Force, the Research Committee has consisted of seven persons including a President who served as chairman and a Dean who served as vice-chairman. The other member brought experience in business affairs, student records, financial aid, institutional research, student affairs and admissions. Both four year and two year institutions have been represented. This kind of representation has been effective and that fact should be part of the consideration as the executive director recommends new appointments.

PROCEDURE: The Research Committee will have two regularly scheduled meetings each year. The first, in the Spring, will be called to review the standing data requests from governmental agencies, new external data requests and to determine the directions for the internal research efforts for the following academic year. The second meeting, in the late summer or early fall, will be designed to review the instrumentation and design of the new research efforts and to review the previous year's research activities. Since the timing of many data requests will probably not fit this schedule, the Director of Research will circulate all available information concerning the requests and will poll the membership concerning their recommendations. If the response does not represent consensus, special arrangements will be made to eliminate differences between committee members. Under any circumstances, both regular and occasional data requests will be judged against three criteria: 1) The purpose for which the data are being gathered; 2) The value to each institution obtained by participating in the data gathering process; and, 3) The impact upon each institution and it's staff of participating in the process.

Committee members will be expected to inform their peers at other member institutions of the activities of the committee. The committee will solicit suggestions from the institutions concerning possible research activity.

Responsibilities of the Research Office to the Committee:

1) The Director of Research will keep committee members apprised of all activities in the areas of committee oversight.

2) The Director will acquaint new members of their responsibilities and of the status of the committee's activities prior to their becoming active committee members.

3) The office will solicit institutional participation and collect the names of the institutional representatives at those institutions which chose to participate in committee sponsored research activities.

4) The office will be responsible for identifying and/or developing data collection instruments for the Council's internal research efforts.

5) The office will handle routine research matters which do not require policy oversight by the committee.

6) The office will provide administrative support for the committee's activities.

Overriding Principle: The Research Committee is selected by the Council and will in the execution of its responsibilities represent expert sensitivity to the policy considerations of research activities. In order to expedite the implementation of committee decisions, the research office will, upon direction of the committee chairman, act upon those decisions without Council review. This is possible, and reasonable, because each institution will have the opportunity to review the Committee's deliberations and make its own decision concerning participation in any research activity.

About That Data Base That is Hiding in the Closet---

A Contributed Paper Presented at the
Southern Association for Institutional Research Annual Conference
October 25, 1979
by
Gerald H. Lunney
Director of Research
Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities
Box 668, Danville, Kentucky 40422 (606)236-3533

For many small institutions, Institutional Research, a part-time exercise, amounts to a process of scrambling around looking for the answers to questions on some external survey instrument. Once the form is completed and mailed it is forgotten as the person responsible for a particular survey gets back to his or her regular duties or to the next external survey that needs to be completed.

Institutional Research at these institutions is fractured, reactive and consists of repeated return to source data for information. There is little time, energy or effort expended on using data for planning. When the idea of planning data is mentioned, the institution responds, "We don't have time to develop a planning data base, we're too busy filling out the HEGIS report."

But what is the HEGIS survey? It is, in fact, a series of survey instruments which describe several dimensions of colleges and universities. Appendix I is a compilation of the data which institutions voluntarily provide to the National Center for Education Statistics through HEGIS. Appendix II is a document reporting the HEGIS history and descriptions of the various survey instruments which was prepared by NCES in May, 1978.

The question then is, since a general survey of higher education exists and is completed by almost all colleges and universities, does it have any potential for use by a small college as the corpus of a planning data system? My response is, yes, with certain limitations. There are at least two important elements which enhance this possibility. One is consistency. HEGIS has a long enough history to have stabilized its several instruments. For the most common parts, last year's form is identical to this year's survey. In addition, the form is standardized. There are definitions for each data element in the survey. This is not to say that each person who completes a HEGIS form interprets the definitions the same, or that everyone completes the form with the information which is requested. Can we be sure that any completion of a survey meets these criteria?

If one is looking for a student specific data base, one which contains detailed information concerning all students which can be stored, retrieved, and manipulated in order to provide aggregated data on an institution's students, then that person is beyond using HEGIS as the basis for her or his planning data base. The same can be said for a personnel specific data base. It is my presumption that the small institution is at "ground zero"; that it is looking for some way to begin to attack the problem of planning data. At this level HEGIS can be helpful. In two or three years an institution may find that its questions can no longer be answered with HEGIS data. At this point the institution is ready for a more sophisticated planning data base.

I do not wish to create the impression that HEGIS is a complete data system. It has serious gaps. One is in the area of personnel. HEGIS annually collects data concerning only the number, rank and salary of full-time faculty members. The survey occasionally collects data concerning administrative personnel. Nothing is included in HEGIS about part-time faculty members or about other institutional personnel. There is another federal form, the EEO-6 Form which provides a comprehensive picture of each institution's personnel. I would suggest that it be used to supplement HEGIS in the area of personnel for the data base. Surprisingly enough, NCES which is charged to gather data to describe the impact of federal programs, does not include anything in the HEGIS package concerning the utilization of federal student financial aid or questions concerning the type and volume of categorical aid. The "Fisap", the form through which the institution reports utilization of financial aid and makes application for continuation of federal aid monies can help in the former area. The latter is still a void. The real theme of my paper is that regular reports and surveys which the institution completes should be reviewed to see if the information provided to the federal government or some other agency might not be used by the institution for planning. HEGIS is only a convenient example, but others might include a state report or a report to your denomination's Board for Higher Education.

How can HEGIS be used? The first step is to gather all of the forms in one place. I suspect that in the small college HEGIS is completed in at least three places, the registrar's office, the business office and the library. Wherever HEGIS is completed, it is viewed as an isolated and painful chore. The same information in the hands of someone with policy and planning concerns can be a gold mine. (I have, perhaps, left out the REAL first step which is to identify someone with the ability and inclination to turn data into answers to policy and planning concerns.) Don't just gather this year's HEGIS but get the last several years. This helps to meet the next suggestion. Do longitudinal studies with HEGIS data. A single datum might produce an aesthetic response but it is only in some context that data have meaning and power. Look at trends over time to determine if and how the institution has changed. In addition to longitudinal studies, do comparative studies using other institutions' HEGIS data. Every

president carries a list of his or her "benchmarks"; those institutions which are judged to be comparable to the president's and against whose performance her or his institution is contrasted. Use these institutions' data for your studies. Another source of comparable institutions is the institutional characteristics survey in HEGIS. The best way to conduct a comparative study is to communicate with other institutions about your research and agree to share the results if the institutions will provide copies of their reports. This fosters cooperation and communication concerning the ways the institutions are interpreting definitions. A group of institutions might get together and share the responsibility for studies using the various HEGIS forms. If this type of cooperative effort is not feasible, an institution can request copies of HEGIS data from a variety of sources including the National Center for Education Statistics. No data which will identify an individual will be released, but all of the rest of the data are in the public domain.

The obvious best procedure is to do annual cross-institutional studies which will provide both longitudinal and comparative information. From that nasty old HEGIS, which everybody has been complaining about, then completing and forgetting, some fairly powerful studies can be done.

What are some studies which might be undertaken using HEGIS information? One possibility which comes to mind at this time is related to the residence and migration survey which is in HEGIS this year for the first time since 1975-76. With these data and some other follow-up, several questions can be answered: Where do the institution's students come from? Have there been any significant shifts in the past four years? Does the enrollment pattern match the institution's objectives for student diversity? How good is the return on money spent by the admissions office at various locations? Adding demographic data, what are the prospects for maintaining or improving the enrollment pattern observed this year?

Data concerning degrees granted are gathered every year in HEGIS. Many questions can be answered with these data: Does the institution's production of graduates match its purpose? Are there any significant shifts in the disciplines in which degrees are being granted? Are there any policy concerns associated with these shifts? Does the pattern of degrees granted match one's intuitive feeling or empirical knowledge about employment possibilities for the institution's graduates?

Longitudinal studies of enrollment data will provide some information about attrition and retention with obvious policy implications. The same data can help establish targets for succeeding years' enrollments.

Analagous studies can be done using financial data, personnel data, library data, etc. Potential cross-institutional studies are fairly obvious.

Before many years have passed, the institutional researcher will no longer be satisfied with the information which he or she can gleen from HEGIS and will develop a sophisticated planning data system. But to start such a system "cold"..... Isn't it worthwhile to take a look at that HEGIS information that has been gathering dust in the closet all these years?

Appendix I

Outline of HEGIS Data Elements

Form 2300-1 Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities
- Name/Address/Phone
- Structure (Single Campus, Main Campus, Branch, Unit of Multi-Campus Institution)
- Date Established/First College Work Offered/ Degrees First Granted
- Accreditation-Regional and Professional
- Institutional Control
- Sex of Student Body
- Calendar
- Level of Offerings
- Types of Programs
- Enrollment
- Admissions Requirements
- Names and Titles of Academic Officers

2300-2.1/2.2 Degrees and Other Awards
- Academic Area by Racial/Ethnic Breakdown by Degree Level by Sex and/or
- Academic Field by Degree Level by Sex

2300-2.3 Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report
- Academic Area (selected) by Full/Part-Time by Academic Level by Racial/Ethic Breakdown by Sex
  or
- Full/Part-Time by Academic Level by Sex

2300-2.8 Residence and Migration of College Students
- State by Degree/Program Level by Sex
- State by First Time Students by Sex
- State by Transfer Students by Sex

2300-2.9 Enrollment by Field
- No longer collected

2300-3 Employees in Institutions of Higher Education
- Titles, Salaries and Sex of Selected Administrators
  and/or
- Salaries, Tenure and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Institutional Faculty

2300-4 Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education (for previous year)
- Current Fund Revenues by Source
- Current Fund Expenditures and Mandatory Transfers by Source
- Physical Plant Assets

2300-4 Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education (for previous years) Continued

Indebtedness on Physical Plant
Endowment Assets
Statement of Changes in Fund Balances
From Public Institutions Only (for the Bureau of the Census)
Selected Revenues
Selected Expenditures
Debt Outstanding, Issued, and Retired
Cash and Security Holdings at the End of the Fiscal Year

2300-5 College and University Library

Current Periodical Subscriptions
Library Collections
Staff by Title by Sex by Full/Part-Time with Salaries
Hours of Student Employment in Libraries
Library Usage
Library Hours/Days per Week
Library Finances

2300-7 Inventory of College and University Facilities

Building Inventory - Condition/Ownership/ Year of Construction by Assignable/Gross Square Feet
Total Campus by Room Use Categories by Assignable Square Feet
Total Campus by Room Use and Program Classification Categories by Assignable Square Feet
Accessibility for Handicapped Students

2300-8 Adult and Continuing Education: Non-Credit Activities in Institutions

Institutional Units that Scheduled Non-Credit Activities
Registration in Non-Credit Adult/Continuing Education by Field (and Continuing Professional Education)
Structure and Administration of Continuing Education

HIGHER EDUCATION GENERAL INFORMATION SURVEY (HEGIS)
FORMS SCHEDULED FOR EACH YEAR

From 1979-80 Through 1982-84

Form Number		XIV 1979	XV 1980	XVI 1981	XVII 1982	XVIII 1983
2300-1	Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities	x	x	x	x	x
2300-2.1	Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred between July 1 and June 30	x*	x	x*	x	x*
2300-2.3A	Fall Enrollment in Higher Education (Post card for preliminary data)		x		x	
2300-2.3	Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education	x	x*	x	x*	x
2300-2.8	Residence and Migration of College Students	x		x		x
2300-3	Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-time Instructional Faculty	x	x	x	x	x
2300-4	Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education for Fiscal Year	x	x	x	x	x
2300-5	College and University Libraries	x	x	x	x	x
2300-7	Inventory of College and University Physical Facilities (for the mobility impaired)		x			
2300-8	Adult/Continuing Education: Non-credit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education (Sample Survey)		s**		s**	

*Race/ethnic information required.

**s represents sample survey, all others measure the population.

HISTORY OF NCES POSTSECONDARY SURVEYS

From 1970-71 Through 1978-79

Form Number	HEGIS	V 1970	VI 1971	VII 1972	VIII 1973	IX 1974	X 1975	XI 1976	XII 1977	XIII 1978
2300-1		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-2.1		x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x*	x
2300-2.3		x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x*
2300-2.8				x			x			
2300-3		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-4		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2300-5			x		x		x		x	
2300-7		x	x			x				
2300-8			s**					s**		

*Race/ethnic information required.

**s represents sample survey, all others measure the population.

CONSISTENCY FOR NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (NCES)
POSTSECONDARY SURVEYS

Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS):

Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities:

Information is reported in July to represent status for coming year. Form has been fairly consistent in structure over the years. Changes have involved variance to the accrediting agencies listed, to the list of administrators to be included, and to the classification of institutions for published information. No change to the form is anticipated in the near future.

Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1 and June 30:

Information is required of the previous year.
(Different forms are used for two-year institutions versus four-year institutions.)
Form has been fairly consistent in structure. Major change has been the addition of racial information for 10 selected programs in 1976-77. Racial data were required again in 1977-78 and then became required biennially in odd years. The form will stay the same with racial areas shaded in years racial data are not required.

Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education or (in even years) Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education:

Information is reported for the current Fall term.
Form has become consistent in the past few years with the major changes being the addition of racial information in 1976-77. Racial data will be required every other year in even years; and when it is required separate forms for 10 selected instructional program areas must be filled out. The form will stay the same with racial areas shaded in years racial data are not required.

Residence and Migration of College Students:

Information is required for the current Fall Term.
Due to the nature of this data it is only collected every three to four years. The form may be required again in 1979-80, but there will be different definitions and the form may be limited to First-Time Freshmen and New Undergraduate Transfers.

Upper Division and Post-Baccalaureate Enrollment by Degree Field (previously entitled Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees prior to 1975-76):
Information is reported for the current Fall term.
Upper division enrollment was collected in 1967, 1975, and 1976 only, but enrollments for advanced degrees were collected every year. There are no further plans to collect information on enrollments by degree field.

Employees in Institutions of Higher Education or entitled Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty (when information on all employees is not collected):
Information is required for staff employed annually and on the payroll as of October 1.
Information collected on employees other than faculty has been very inconsistent and in lieu of trying to collect this information again, NCES will be trying to use the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Employment Survey. Faculty information collected has been fairly consistent, however. The major change was the inclusion of information previously collected by AAUP on salaries for continuing faculty in the 1977-78 form.

Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education:
Information is required for the previous fiscal year.
For 1975-76 the HEGIS financial definitions and form became compatible with the Higher Education Finance Manual (HEFM) and College and University Business Administration (CUBA). (This causes financial data collection in previous years to be incompatible with financial data collected from 1975 on.) A change in 1978-79 will be the dropping of Part G (the last page of the survey) which was required of public institutions for Bureau of the Census purposes in 1977-78. There may be future modifications to the form and definitions but they will be worked out with NACUBO.

College and University Libraries:
Information is required as of the Fall term.
Special data are sometimes required, but generally the form has been fairly consistent.

Inventory of College and University Facilities:
Information has been required as of September of the survey year.
This form has not been collected since 1974, and it will be changing to collect information on accessibility to higher education facilities for handicapped students--probably by student programs. A feasibility study using selected institutions will be conducted in 1978-79, and the full survey of all institutions will be conducted in 1980-81.

Adult/Continuing Education: Non-Credit Activities in Institutions of Higher Education:
Information is required for the previous full fiscal year.
A stratified sample of higher education institutions is selected to participate in survey years. (Surveys have been done in 1968 for 1967-68, in 1976 for 1975-76, and will be done in 1978 for 1977-78.) Additionally, in 1971, 65 selected institutions were asked to respond about training programs they had for adult education.

Postsecondary Education Forms not part of HEGIS:

Postsecondary Career School Survey:
Information is reported regarding any changes since the last biennial survey.
This biennial survey was begun in 1970 to collect data on non-collegiate postsecondary schools (not required to report in HEGIS) which provide occupational training; and the survey results in a biennial publication of directories. (This form sometimes goes to state agencies and sometimes goes directly to institutions, depending upon the state agency's agreement with NCES.)

Vocational Education Data System(VEDS):
Information will be reported for the previous year of July 1-June 30.
This survey will be filled out by state agencies (sometimes higher education and sometimes vocational/technical education agencies) to represent the total state and will not be collected from institutions or represent individual institutions. A feasibility study was conducted using 8 states in 1977-78 (for 1976-77 data), and a full survey of all states will be conducted in 1979 (for 1978-79 data). States will still have to provide vocational education data in 1978-79 to the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) using its standard forms.

Summary of the Final SLIB Structure

The Selection of Data to Address Planning Issues, the SLIB document that deals specifically with data needs and collection, focuses on four major areas and suggests the following general questions:

Need/Demand for Postsecondary-Education Services:

A. What are the collective needs of the citizens in the state?

- Can employment patterns in particular occupations be analyzed to determine if there is a labor shortage or labor surplus?
- Are there particular educational and training programs in which the state wants to promote a specific labor interest?
- Can changes be made to allow for broader accessibility to postsecondary education?
- Are there special activities in research and public service that can be provided through postsecondary-education resources and facilities, once specific state-level needs have been identified?

B. What is the individual demand in the state for access to postsecondary-education programs/institutions and the potential opportunities to be derived?

Responsiveness of the Postsecondary-Education Enterprise:

A. What are the characteristics of programs and institutions available in the state (kinds, sizes, geographic location, quality)?

B. What changes might be required to the existing postsecondary-education structure in regard to:

- Addition or deletion of programs/institutions?
- Improvement of quality/prestige of programs/institutions?
- Sharing of program resources within an institution and/or among institutions?
- Expansion from traditional higher-education concepts to an understanding of broader postsecondary-education needs?

Resources Required to Support the Postsecondary-Education Enterprises:

A. What are the amount, characteristics, and utilization of current resources (finances, personnel, facilities)?

B. Can areas be identified where qualitative and quantitative improvement can be made?

C. If there is a change in emphasis or demand, will additional resources be needed, or can utilization of existing resources be improved?

Financial Policies Related to the Acquisition and Distribution of Resources:

A. What proportion of costs are to be borne by the state versus other sources, such as local governments, students, and so forth?

B. To what extent will different financing policies apply to different kinds of institutions, programs, and services?

C. What mechanism will be used for distribution of state funds (that is, how much will be distributed directly to institutions versus indirectly through programs of student financial aid)?

D. How does the effect of resource-allocation procedures compare to the intent of the financing policies?

The CIKCU-Ford Task Force affirms the importance of these issues to the statewide planning process, while stressing that prudence be exercised in the adoption of particular data requests to address those issues.

Kentucky Ford Project Reactions to the

Preliminary SLIB Data Tables

Section 1

State-Level Need/Demand

Table 1-1 : Total State Population - Estimates and Projections
1-2 : Population by County, by Age, Sex and Race
1-3 : State Population Density by Race and Sex
1-4 : Distribution of Family Income
1-5A : Educational Attainment by County (Elementary, Secondary, College)
1-5B : State Vocational Education Attainment
1-6 : Elementary/Secondary Enrollments
1-7 : High School Graduates and GED Recipients
1-14A: State Industry - Occupational Matrix of Employment
1-14B: National Industry - Occupational Matrix of Employment
1-15A: Number of Job Applicants and Job Openings by Occupational Group in the State
1-15B: Number of Job Applicants and Job Openings by Occupational Group in the Nation

Tables 1-1 through 1-7, 14 and 15 call for state-wide census-type data. These data are maintained by some agency or state or federal government. Their collection and maintenance by the state higher education agency would facilitate their use for higher education planning at the institutional level (both state supported and independent), at the sector level and at the state level. If each state was to maintain these data within its state agency, institutions which draw significant numbers of students from out of state would have a single source for information from states about which they are concerned. We strongly urge each state agency to collect, maintain and share the information contained in these nine tables.

Table 1-8 : Applications/Admissions/Enrollments Information by Student Level.

Because of multiple applications, the application and admission data would not provide valid measures of student demand. The enrollment information is contained on other forms. Since this table fails to generate valid, unduplicated data that is necessary for planning, the independent colleges suggest that it be eliminated from the SLIB package.

Table 1-9 : Geographic Origin of First Time Entering Students: Headcount by Student Level.

The independent institutions suggest that the row labeled "In-District by County" be eliminated as it is not germane to their situation. Moreover, transfer students information should be collected "by Institution" rather than "In State by Institution." The existing column seeks to gather data that is too restricted, while many of the independent and state institutions do, in fact, attract numerous transfer students from particular out-of-state colleges and universities. The data that this revised column would generate, in addition to those generated by the remainder of the table, would provide information crucial to sound policy decisions, most specifically in the area concerning the portability of financial aid.

Table 1-10 : Ability Descriptors of First Time Entering Undergraduate students.

This table seeks to provide necessary student description information, yet to be truly effective high school rank percentile breakdowns need to be less arbitrary. In order to be useful to the independent institutions, and to make use of current operational data, these rankings should be adjusted to fit existing procedures. Furthermore, to prevent the non-judicious public use of such information, the rankings should be aggregated for the independent institutions. This process would in no way interfere with the statewide planning process and would enable each institution to maintain a greater degree of autonomy.

Table 1-11A: Sex and Racial/Ethnic Characteristics for Full-Time Students (Unduplicated Headcount) Enrolled in the Institution.

The independent institutions suggest that the columns labeled "Other, 2nd Year, 3rd Year, and 4th Year" be deleted. By supplying the data requested under "1st Time Entering" and "Total" an adequate description of students is generated without mandating unnecessary labor and cost.

Table 1-11B: Sex and Racial/Ethnic Characteristics for Part-Time Students.

Same as 1-11A.

Table 1-12 : Age of Students (Unduplicated Headcount) Enrolled in the institution.

Because "Age" is an increasingly important data element in these changing times of Higher Education, the independent institutions view this table as relevant to the statewide planning process.

Table 1-13A: Full-Time Student Enrollments by Program and Student Level.
1-13B: Part-Time Student Enrollments by Program and Student Level.

It is the feeling of the independent institutions that these tables require data that is unnecessary for planning purposes. Enrollment by program and student level is given to constant fluctuation thereby making its relevance uncertain. Furthermore, if such data is meant to serve manpower projections, such projections can easily be made from "Degrees Conferred" data. For this reason, and because such data is both costly and time-consuming to generate, the independent institutions suggest that this table be eliminated.

Table 1-X : Headcount Enrollments of Persons in Special Programs.

The independent colleges feel that more attention, and specific attention be paid to the non-traditional services which all institutions provide to their community members and other interested persons. Another table should be created which will allow institutions to list these special service programs, either individually or institutionally defined categories. This table would provide space for listing of contact hours and number of enrollments. This table would also provide space for listing the number of Continuing Credit Units and Regular Course Credits that were awarded through these special programs.

Section 2

Availability of Postsecondary Programs

Table 2-1 : Institutional Inventory and Descriptors.

With the exception of the word "superior" in Section F, subsection 3, the independent institutions accept the data generated by this table. In that it is operational data and data that most institutions already possess, the cost of supplying this information to the state would be minimal. Moreover, this data would serve to make the state agency aware of what programs, etc. the independent sector is providing, where these programs are located, and at what cost they are available to potential students. The data sought herein would serve a necessary purpose in the statewide planning function.

Table 2-2 : Inventory of Student Program Offerings.
2-3 : Number of Student Program Completers.

The independent institutions endorse the inclusion of these tables for the same reasons given under 2-1. The data generated would serve to give a more complete picture of the service the independent sector is providing, while at the same time increasing the effectiveness of the statewide planning operation.

Table 2-4 : Outcome Information for Program Completers.

The independent institutions see value in the data requested in page one of this table: i.e. program completers broken down by Sex, Age, and Race. The additional characteristics requested on Pages 2 and 3 of this table, however, seem to be arbitrarily detailed, demanding information that is neither easily retrieved nor pertinent to the planning function. For these reasons, the independent sector suggests that these two pages be eliminated.

Table 2-5 : Number of Students Exiting the Institution Without Completing a Degree/Diploma/Certificate Program.

The data sought in this table are too detailed and too difficult to amass to be practical for the independent institutions to supply. What's more they seem in no way to be relevant to statewide planning. It is suggested, then, that the independent sector collect this data on an "Institutional Total" level only, and that this data then be supplied to the state only when the state agency offers a sound rationale for its need.

Section 3

Data Concerning Resources Being Devoted to Postsecondary Education, Their Characteristics, Availability and Usage

Table 3-1 : Current Funds Revenues - Unrestricted and Designated Funds.

The data sought in this table are already provided to the Federal government and are therefore readily accessible. For this reason this table is acceptable to the independent institutions.

Table 3-2 : Sources and Uses of Current Funds Revenues.

This table represents a two dimensional array of income and expenditures which would be of significance in matters of internal management. The information contained in the table, however, when being provided for external use could be provided in a form which would place the institutions in a favorable light and which would not represent the actual relationship between revenues and expenditures. The column totals duplicate the information contained in Table 3-1 and the row totals represent the expenditures for educational and general activities which are currently provided to the government. These row totals should provide sufficient information in the form in which they are already supplied. Therefore, the independent institutions suggest that this table be eliminated from the SLIB document.

Table 3-3 : Contributions to Retirement Funds for Higher Education.

This table is an important element of the SLIB document, but it should not be required of institutions that do not receive government contributions for retirement funds.

Table 3-4 : Balance Sheet Information and Changes in Fund Balances.
3-5 : Information About Endowment.
3-6 : Debt Outstanding, Issued and Retired.
3-7 : Debt Service by Source of Funds.
3-8 : Physical Plant Indebtedness.

These tables require detailed information about the long-term financial condition of an institution of higher education. But while some of these data concerning independent institutions will be of value to the state agency, the detail sought exceeds the state's need for planning. (Further work needs to be done to define which data elements regarding the long-term financial condition of an independent institution shall be required to supply.) <u>These data elements should not be provided for this and two other reasons. These data are currently being reported in other formats. In addition, the Council of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities will, from time to time, prepare information about these aspects of the financial health of the institutions involved</u>.

Table 3- 9 : Direct Costs of Institution by Discipline.
3-10 : Direct Costs of Instruction by Student Program.

These tables seek to generate cost study information, information which is necessary for planning in the state institutions but which is not germane to the independent sector.

Table 3-11 : Numbers of Employees by Category.

This data can be derived from EEOC, thus the independent institutions suggest that this table not be included in the SLIB document.

Table 3-12 : Tenure and Discipline Category of Instruction/Research Employees.

This table is extremely detailed and, as such, goes beyond the amount of information needed for planning purposes while necessitating an inordinate amount of preparation time on the part of the independent institutions. Therefore, the independent sector suggests that this table be eliminated from the SLIB document.

Table 3-13 : Age Distribution of Full-Time Instruction/Research Employees.

While the data generated by this table would be useful in aggregate form to the independent institutions, it is not information that is necessary to the state agency's planning function.

Table 3-14 : Salaries and Rank of Full-Time Instructional/Research Faculty.

The data generated by this table are already provided through the HEGIS survey. Thus, the state agency should obtain this information from that source.

Table 3-15 : Activity Data of Instruction/Research Staff by Major Program Category (PCS).
3-16 : Instructional Activity Information (Student and Faculty Contact Hours) by Discipline.

The data sought in these tables are neither operational nor necessary for planning purposes. Therefore, the independent institutions recommend that these tables be eliminated from the SLIB document.

Table 3-17 : Inventory and Allocation of Types of Facilities by Program Area.
3-18 : Condition of Academic/Administrative Buildings.

The information sought in these tables is already provided through the HEGIS survey. The independent institutions recommend that the state agency obtain this information from those forms.

Section 4

Financing of Postsecondary Education

Table 4-1 : State Government Revenues.
4-2 : State Government Appropriations and Expenditures.
4-3 : Local Government Revenues.
4-4 : Local Government Appropriations and Expenditures.

The above tables seek data that are clearly the domain of the state and local governmental agencies and, as such, are inappropriate for the independent institutions.

Table 4-5 : Postsecondary Institutional Support.

This data, while necessary for statewide planning, can be obtained from existing data supplies. Therefore, the independent sector sees no need for the inclusion of this particular table.

Table 4-6 : Information About Student Financial Aid Available From Postsecondary Institutions.

Since information regarding monies allotted under several of the federal grants programs are not readily available to the institutions unless an individual student is also receiving institutional aid, the independent sector recommends that the data in this table be collected only in the row labeled "Total." The data thus generated would be sufficient for determining broad statewide planning policies, without demanding an inordinate commitment of man hours on the part of the independent institutions.

Table 4-7 : Information About Student Financial Aid Available From the State Postsecondary Agency.

These data are already on record with the Kentucky Higher Education Assistance Authority, thereby rendering this table unnecessary.

Table 4-8 : Information About Student Financial Aid Available From the Federal Government

As in Table 4-6, much of the information requested in this table is unavailable to the independent institutions. Therefore, it is recommended that this table be completed only for the row labeled "Total."

Section 5

Affirmative Action

Table 5-1 : Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education.

The data requested in this table duplicate that of Tables 1-11A and 1-11B. The independent sector will supply "Field Name and Number" to the Federal Government because it is mandated to do so, but this table need not be completed for the state agency.

Table 5-2 : First Professional Degrees Conferred in Selected Fields.

The data requested in this table again duplicate information sought in Tables 1-11A and 1-11B. For this reason, the independent sector suggests that this table not be included.

Table 5-3 : Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's Degrees Conferred.
5-4 : Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctor's Degrees Conferred by Racial/Ethnic Category.
5-5 : Degrees and Awards Conferred Based on Less Than 4 Years of Work Beyond High School.
5-6 : Degrees and Awards Conferred by Racial/Ethnic Category Based on Less Than 4 Years Work Beyond High School.

With the exception of the breakdown by "Sex," the data that would be generated by the above tables have already been provided in Tables 2-3 and 2-4. To reproduce such data in a slightly different form would be counterproductive and extremely costly. Therefore, the independent institutions would recommend that slight alterations be made in Tables 2-3 and 2-4 to accommodate the "Sex" breakdown, thus eliminating these tables in Section 5.